(Case called)

MR. WIRSHBA: Good afternoon, your Honor. Kyle Wirshba, for the government.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Wirshba.

And for Otto Salguero?

MR. FEITEL: Good afternoon, your Honor. Robert

Feitel, for the defendant, Otto Salguero-Morales. My client is present in court today.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Feitel.

And for Ronald Salguero-Portillo?

MR. ZAPP: David Zapp, your Honor. And good afternoon to you.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

The first order of business will be whether I have everything I should have.

I have a presentence report, recommendation, and addendum as to Ronald Enrique Salguero-Portillo that was revised by probation on March 3, 2023. I have a letter from Mr. Zapp, dated March 6, 2023. I have a letter from Mr. Zapp, dated June 13, 2023. And I have a letter from Mr. Zapp, dated June 14, 2023.

As to Otto Rene Salguero-Morales, I have a letter from Mr. Feitel, dated June 20, and I also have a memorandum from Mr. Feitel that is also dated June 20, 2023.

I have a letter from the government, dated June 20,

```
N6RKMORS
```

2023.

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{Do}}$$  I have everything on the subject of sentencing,  $$\operatorname{\textsc{Mr}}$.$  Zapp?

MR. ZAPP: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Feitel?

MR. FEITEL: Your Honor, I received the initial version of the presentence report in this case, and I had submitted comments to probation, which were mostly factual matters, and the final version of the presentence report incorporated those changes. I think that's the only matter left for my client, Mr. Salguero.

THE COURT: But that would not be anything that would come to me. I wouldn't see your letter, I wouldn't see the preliminary version. So the question is whether I have what I should have for the purposes of sentencing?

MR. FEITEL: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Same question for the government?

MR. WIRSHBA: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

Mr. Zapp, has your client read, reviewed, and discussed with you the presentence report, recommendation, and addendum?

MR. ZAPP: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Does he have any objections to the facts set forth in the PSR?

MR. ZAPP: We filed certain objections, and that was 1 2 it. 3 THE COURT: With whom? 4 MR. ZAPP: With the probation office. 5 THE COURT: Okay. And what happened? 6 They went to the government, asked if I was MR. ZAPP: 7 representing -- what I was representing, was it valid, and, depending on what the government told the probation office, 8 9 that's what they accepted. 10 THE COURT: Okay. I just had a discussion with Mr. Feitel on this. 11 12 It goes like this, Mr. Zapp: I don't see the draft 13 presentence report, I don't see your objections, I don't see 14 the comments by the government. I receive the document that I 15 described to you, that's revised on March 3rd, 2023. 16 I have no idea what went on before that. My question 17 is: Does the defendant have any objections to the facts set 18 forth in the presentence report revised on March 3rd, 2023? 19 MR. ZAPP: No. 20 (Counsel confer) 21 MR. ZAPP: Apparently, my objections are in the copy 22 that you have. So then I have --23 THE COURT: Well, have you seen the presentence 24 report? 25 MR. ZAPP: Have I seen it?

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Yes. 1 2 MR. ZAPP: Yes, I've seen it. 3 THE COURT: The question was, before I think I asked: 4 Has your client received, reviewed, and discussed with you the 5 presentence report, recommendation, and addendum, and I thought 6 you said yes. 7 MR. ZAPP: Yes, we did discuss it. 8 THE COURT: Okay. 9 And that's the report revised on March 3, 2023? 10 MR. ZAPP: Yes. 11

THE COURT: Do you or your client have any objections to the facts set forth in that report?

MR. ZAPP: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you have any objections to the guideline calculation set forth in the presentence report?

MR. ZAPP: I just want to be clear on that. I did sign that agreement, and in that agreement, there was no objection to the guideline. It doesn't mean I have to like it, but I did sign it, and I am bound by it.

THE COURT: I'm asking you a question. I have a presentence report that was revised by probation on March 3rd, 2023. It has a guideline calculation in it. It's found on, among other places, page 25 of the PSR.

My question is: Do you have any objection to that guideline calculation?

22

23

24

25

1 MR. ZAPP: No, your Honor. 2 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Feitel, has your client read, reviewed, and 3 4 discussed the presentence report, revised on March 10, 2023? 5 MR. FEITEL: Yes, your Honor. 6 THE COURT: Does the defendant have any objections to 7 the facts set forth in the presentence report? MR. FEITEL: No, your Honor. 8 9 THE COURT: Does the defendant have any objections to 10 the guideline calculations set forth in the presentence report? 11 MR. FEITEL: No, sir. 12 THE COURT: All right. 13 Does the government have any objections to the facts 14 set forth in Ronald Salguero's presentence report or Otto 15 Salguero's presentence report? 16 MR. WIRSHBA: No, your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Does the government have any objection to 18 the guideline calculations in either of those two reports? MR. WIRSHBA: No, your Honor. 19 20 THE COURT: Okay.

I adopt as my findings of fact the facts set forth in the Ronald Salguero presentence report, and I find the guidelines are correctly calculated at total offense level 37, Criminal History Category I. The statutory term on Count One is ten years to life, the statutory term on Count Three is up

to life imprisonment, and the guideline range is 210 to 262 months.

As to Otto Salguero: I adopt as my findings of fact the facts set forth in the presentence report. It happens that his total offense level is also 37, Criminal History

Category I. The statutory ranges and the guideline ranges are the same as I just described for Ronald Salguero.

I'll now give the parties an opportunity to speak. I want to first ask Mr. Feitel a question or two.

Did you see Mr. Zapp's letters of June 13 and June 14?
MR. FEITEL: I did, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

And thereafter, and after the government put in its sentencing submission, you put in a sentencing submission to me dated June 20th. Is that correct?

MR. FEITEL: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Why is your sentencing submission not a breach of your plea agreement with the government, just as Mr. Zapp conceded in his letter of June 14?

MR. FEITEL: I am not asking your Honor to downwardly depart in this case. I'm asking for a variance, which is a part of 3553(e) and is not, I do not believe, a violation of the plea agreement between my client and the United States.

THE COURT: Okay. So let me just understand here — you are not asking for a minor role in the offense adjustment

under the guidelines?

MR. FEITEL: No, sir.

THE COURT: Because I misread your memo.

Well, I'm reading, in page 6, your argument on minor role: This decreases his offense level by two levels.

Why isn't that a departure?

MR. FEITEL: Your Honor --

THE COURT: This would result in an adjusted guideline level of 31, which is equal to 108 to 135 months.

MR. FEITEL: I take your Honor's point. The sentence that follows says that, by analogy, the defendant believes that this calculation would be relevant to the Court's consideration of the requested downward variance.

I used the departure as a point of reference for the request for the variance. I did not mean to suggest in any way that I was asking this Court for a downward departure, and I apologize if this particular phraseology was less than clear.

THE COURT: All right.

Let me invite each set of counsel -- first I think
I'll do Otto Salguero. And one of the questions that is not
entirely clear from the materials before me is, I think,
Mr. Feitel, you said that you negotiated with the federal
government for your client's surrender in Miami, if I
understood that correctly. I wanted to find out, because I
think it may be relevant to sentencing, why did you so

negotiate with the government, and why did your client surrender to federal authorities in Miami?

MR. FEITEL: With respect to the first inquiry, your Honor, my client learned that there had been an indictment returned against him. It was a matter of public knowledge; it wasn't returned under seal.

At that time, Mr. Ronald Salguero and Otto Salguero contacted me through the auspices of a Guatemala lawyer, and I met with them, and I discussed the case. They advised me that they did not wish to be arrested in Guatemala, they did not wish to be incarcerated in Guatemala, they wanted to come to the United States as quickly as they could, and they wanted to try to, in other words, resolve this situation.

Not to digress, but your Honor may recall that during the trial of Tony Hernandez, there was testimony about the murder of a Honduran national named Magdaleno Funez or Nery Sanabria — he had aliases — who was killed in a Honduran jail while awaiting extradition. He was also one of my now former clients. And I believe that that murder and the attendant publicity also was a motivating factor. Your Honor is shaking. It's obvious the reason why.

As to why my client surrendered in Miami, that was a matter solely of available flights. They would have preferred to have come to this jurisdiction. We waived venue in connection with their coming to Miami. But at the time of year

that the flights were scheduled, I think the only place they could go was to Miami. And then your Honor may recall that was right around COVID. I don't recall if there were limited flights, but it was in that moment.

And so the government allowed my clients to come. They were both my clients at the time, for convenience.

THE COURT: I remember that.

MR. FEITEL: They arranged for them to be granted special parole entry visas for the limited purpose of surrender, and, with that, they both came to the United States voluntarily, that is, not in custody, although, as I mentioned, they knew what was going to happen because I told them to a certainty what was going to happen.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. That's very helpful.

But this is your opportunity to speak on behalf of
your client, and then I'm going to give your client an
opportunity to speak, and do the same with your codefendant.

MR. FEITEL: Thank you, your Honor.

I want to start by mentioning that there are members of both the Salgueros' family in the courtroom today. My client's sisters and some nieces and other family members are here for support. They live in the United States. And that's going to figure into the request I make at the end for designation.

Your Honor, I'm asking your Honor -- I should say that

we are in agreement about the guidelines. This was a plea offer that was negotiated, accepted, and is enforceable. There is no argument here that it's not what my client entered into, and we are in agreement with the government about the guideline range.

My request is that your Honor consider the factors in the sentencing statute and give my client a variance downward to the mandatory minimum in this case. I hope that much was clear from my memorandum.

The principal reason for my asking it is that I think that my client's role in this offense relative to everyone else was, in the vernacular, minor. My client was, for all intents and purposes, an intermediary between other drug traffickers. He was helping to transport cocaine from the border between Guatemala and Honduras to the farm where he lived, and then it was moved onward.

He is both the beneficiary and the victim of that geography. He was paid a commission. I don't believe that there's any evidence, and I don't think the government has argued, that my client invested or that he controlled the routes. And although the government notes in its pleading that my client played an essential role, I think a fair response is, he did not play a role that requires some special technical skill or knowledge. He drove the trucks, and they hid the cocaine on the farm.

He wasn't, in that sense, a pilot or someone who was a chemist or someone who brought to bear some particularly unique set of skills; he simply was a person with a farm in the right location who drove a truck.

And to the extent that my client's service was a link in the chain, I don't think it could really be principally argued that there wouldn't have been someone else who would have done what he did. That's not to excuse what he did. This is not an excuse; it's for context. There does not seem to be anywhere in Central and South America, from what I can determine — and I'm sure your Honor has seen it in your cases — any reluctance on people to become involved in these matters. When one person is arrested, someone else in the drug organization hierarchy takes their place.

But my client's role was really sort of a mule with a truck and a piece of land. And so, in that sense, I'd ask your Honor to give him some consideration, because he was not a leader.

The other defendants in this line of cases occupy a completely different position, both in Guatemala and in Honduran society, and in the actions that they took. I have read the transcripts of the trial of Tony Hernandez, I've read the sentencing memorandum of the other defendants that were convicted before your Honor, I've actually even read the government's 404(b) motion in the upcoming trial. Those

documents are replete with violence, and I don't mean ordinary violence associated with drug trafficking; we're talking about violence in its most primal sense that seemed, as I put in my memo, kind of unrelenting. There's no allegation that my client was involved in any of those things.

In fact, what the government says about the weapons is that the weapons were provided by other members of the conspiracy to protect their merchandise. That's actually, I think, paraphrasing what the government said.

Also, to the extent that the government notes — and I think correctly — that large quantities of drugs were moved, that's another matter that was outside my client's control. If there was five kilos, that's what they moved; if there was 5,000, that's what they moved. And I think, in context, it reflects both the sort of never-ending avarice of the other defendants in this case that my client was the person who did what they told him to do. He didn't schedule the loads.

So with respect to that aspect of the case, I'd ask your Honor to consider giving him a downward variance because his role was, in the larger scheme of things, relatively smaller than the others.

I noted some other factors for your Honor's consideration. I just want to briefly go over them. One was the one we discussed today, which is my client came here voluntarily. And your Honor knows, in the line of cases where

my client is charged, there's still absent fugitives. There's a defendant named Mario Calix. He's been out since time began. I don't remember which superseding indictment he is. My client did not — and the same for Ronald Salguero, even though I don't represent him today — neither of them considered hiding or running or going to ground in the vernacular or going someplace else. Guatemala is a rural country. It is possible to hide. They came here, they came here right before COVID. COVID was in the news. I discussed with the government these matters, I discussed with my clients. And, at the end of the day, their choices were come now or possibly never be able to come. So they did. I was in this courthouse for their initial appearance. They went with the marshals after they were held without bond by consent, and they were sent to the MDC. And I think it was the next day that the facility closed.

I recognize, and so does my client, jails are not hotels. No one could say otherwise. They're not designed to be. But the conditions of confinement during the pandemic, I think, were exponentially harsher than people would have been able to foresee. And I think there was also an unpreparedness on the part of society in general and on the Bureau of Prisons, in particular, and in jails all over this country. I cite to some matters in my pleading, but I don't think it really is beyond the ken of an ordinary person to understand that when the government told us, in the person of Fauci, who everyone

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

seems to be upset with, that we should all socially distance, most people were able to or tried to, to the extent they could. Inmates incarcerated were left to basically suffer at the hands of the jailers and of the conditions of confinement, which generally are not very large - people are tucked into cells and there was, in my client's mind, a gigantic fear of contracting COVID. He's not a young man, and I think that there are cases from the neighboring jurisdiction, the Eastern District of New York, that I cited about giving some credit for it. And I think your Honor may also recall that when the FIRST STEP Act passed, and there was talk of giving sentence reductions to people and letting people out of jail, the factors of age and COVID factored into that and were considered by courts here and in other jurisdictions. And, in the same way, I think it would be relevant, since my client has come through to the other side of the pandemic, to at least acknowledge that there should be some benefit for it, because it was not of his own design, and he was basically -- he suffered at the hands of others, and not with bad intentions, but just because of the rapidity and the sort of unexpected nature of the pandemic.

In that regard, your Honor, my client also is 61 or 2. If your Honor imposes the ten years that I asked for, that is an extraordinarily long period of time for someone with his age. It is -- and it's a hard argument to make in front of

your Honor, and I have trouble with it because I'm actually older than my client, but the reality is I know that the next ten years of my life are really probably the -- I hope I survive. That's my bottom line. There's a chance my client might not make it to 70. And if he does, he will be a changed person.

There is a distinction. I'm going to be 65 this summer, perhaps your Honor will be 65 soon, and I think that there is a difference between that and being in your seventies. I do think that to the extent that age correlates with recidivism, given my client's surrender, given the publicity surrounding these cases, the chances of him becoming a recidivist are statistically less than zero. No one could guarantee it — that would be a crazy thing to say — but under the circumstances of this case, I don't really see how my client is going to go back to drug trafficking. I think it more likely, as I explained in my memo, that he will return to his life to basically eke out the days that remain to him with his family and friends in solitude.

I think he is also going to be their -- there's always some risk in the future, that even when you plead, someone is going to take it as a grievous insult to their drug-trafficking business. I didn't argue about danger because there's nothing specific to hang it on, but it is always in my mind that anyone who comes here and returns faces problems.

And your Honor knows my client did meet with the government; the parties both acknowledge that. He's, unfortunately, not in a position to be able to cooperate, which would have helped his situation, but he is not able to. And because of the weapons belonging to others, he loses the safety valve, and there's also an amendment pending of the federal sentencing guidelines that becomes effective in November, which provides for an additional reduction in sentence if someone has no criminal history points. For zero criminal history points, there's going to be a two-level reduction. My client would not be amenable to that because of the gun in this case.

So the gun causes him two points up and takes away four points down, the safety valve, and then it takes away the sentencing change that's coming in November.

The only other thing that I wanted to say to your Honor about my client, just to make sure I got everything, at the end, my client came here, he knew what he was facing, he knew what was going to happen to him, and he did it anyway. To be fair, not that it's relevant here completely, I've had clients who said they were going to come and still are nowhere to be seen. So, I think Mr. Salguero and his codefendant, Ronald Salguero, made the decision, they carried through with it. Unlike the overwhelming majority of codefendants in this line of cases, they pled guilty. They admitted their guilt. They did not have a trial. Your Honor has presided, I think,

at least over two trials, and there's one more coming with three more defendants. My client stands apart. He acknowledged guilt, and he acknowledged responsibility. He's done all that he can to try to ameliorate what happened to him.

He also — and I don't think this is disputed — stopped working in drug trafficking back in 2011 or 2012, and I discussed the massacre at his farm perpetrated by a criminal organization called the Zetas in Mexico. I think Mr. Zapp also references it.

My client had been slowing down working, but if there was ever an event that would lead a rational person to stop being a drug trafficker, it was the massacre. The Zetas decapitated some 20 odd or more people. They kidnapped and killed my client's niece and two of his nephews.

And I understand that violence comes with the terrain, and so does my client. It would be impossible to think otherwise or to principally argue otherwise, but the kind of violence that was perpetrated in this case, I think, stands apart in terms of its brutal nature and in terms of the number of victims in the case, and my client did stop participating. It's not a defense in this case. The law in this circuit is much more complicated about withdrawal from a conspiracy. It requires not only a cessation of activities or requires the person to take some affirmative step to thwart the goal of the conspiracy, for which I will never understand what my client

could have done, but perhaps he could have, but he did not.

So, he did not have that defense available to him. And in the end of the day, he accepted responsibility for what he had done.

I hope your Honor will be able to show some measure of mercy for him because the primary goal of criminal justice in this country cannot only be punishment. My client is going to be punished, even at the mandatory minimum, beyond what can be imagined. When I think of the time, I always try to think of the difference between my children at birth and them at ten years old or between ten and twenty. It is a long period of time. And Mr. Salguero is in good health, thank God, but he is not a young man.

With that, I'd be glad to answer any questions your Honor might have, but I'll tell your Honor that I asked my client — I told my client, less is more when you speak to the judge. It's advice I have. Not everyone takes it. But the only other thing I would ask the Court is if you could designate my client, or at least recommend the designation — because I know that despite being an Article III judge, your Honor doesn't have power over the Bureau of Prisons — if you would designate him to Fort Dix, please, which is FCI in New Jersey.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. FEITEL: Thank you.

Mr. Otto Salguero, this is your opportunity to speak to address the Court directly to bring to my attention any facts or circumstances that you believe I should take account of today. If there's anything you wish to say, this is the time to say it. And you may remain seated.

And, Mr. Feitel, if you could just move your microphone closer to your client there. Just move it over.

Yes, that's good.

DEFENDANT SALGUERO-MORALES: Thank you, your Honor.

First, I would like to ask God for forgiveness, the government of the United States, and you, your Honor, for the wrongdoing I committed.

I would like you to consider my age, and I would like to go back to my family and my children, your Honor.

I would like you to have mercy with me, your Honor. I don't really have the words to express myself.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Zapp, this is your opportunity to speak on behalf of your client.

MR. ZAPP: Thank you, your Honor.

First, let me say that it's not a matter of stealing my thunder, because I welcome the fact that my cocounsel, or my counsel, the other counsel, said all the things that he did, and he said it very eloquently. And I know this Court wants

Honor, so I will do that, and I will make sure not to tread.

As much as I like to perform, I am not going to perform. I'm going to rely on what my cocounsel said, because the fact is, every single thing that he said can apply to my client. I would go a little more poetic, shall we say, because I think that what drove my client, and I assume, to do a good deed for my cocounsel's client, they could not live life as fugitives.

I noticed in the trial that you had with, I guess his name is Tony, there was a moment there where the government said that they wanted to play a stipulated conversation. It was a wiretapped conversation. And it was a wiretapped conversation between two men, and one of the men either wanted the money or the drugs, and there was pressures from above.

And I remember what was said, and I thought it was very significant because it was a better way of saying it than I did. What I'm talking about is that there was a point where one of the men say to the other one: What if I tell this man, because he's pestering me and saying that he wants me to name a day, and this way, you can think of your people, whether they can solve this for you by a particular day. And the other male says: Those hillbillies don't even work on Sundays.

Well, I would not have thought of the word hillbillies because I would have thought of the word rube, I would have thought of the word hick, I would have thought of the word

country bumpkin, and all of them, I think, are too pejorative, and they don't merit that. The fact is, they were born in the jungle, and they live in the jungle, and they refer to Guatemala City as the capital, and the difference is enormous.

So I think that what Mr. Feitel has said deals with what they did and how little they did in this particular case. And this conversation can tell you, your Honor, who you're dealing with, who both of these people are. These people are hillbillies. They are people that have nothing to do with what is often described here as state-sponsored narcotics trafficking. The fact is that either one of these guys could have been caught in Avenue C or Avenue B and brought here, and, if I can speak out of turn, get ten years, and everybody would go home believing that they had been dealt with correctly. Some, especially in Manhattan, might have thought they could get less, given all the circumstances, but, as my grandmother would say, dayenu, we should have been satisfied at ten, and we should be satisfied at ten.

I think it is a just sentence. They may think differently. And I can tell you, I am saying this not trying to sell a used car here, because if I came up here, and I said, listen, they don't deserve more than five years, I'd be intellectually dishonest. That's not what I feel. But I also feel that 17 is beyond the pale, 15 is beyond the pale, and the difference between 12 and 10 is, again, one of those

comparisons where at least the legislature, the statute, says, if you are confronted with two equally reasonable — reasonable — sentences, then you should take the short one under the rule of lenity. And this is what I'm thinking.

Mr. Feitel had mentioned something in his report that was all the things that I thought about. There were times when I was with my client, and I would leave and say, I wish you could have been in the room with me, because I can't express just how bad I feel for this guy. Because this guy — and I think he will tell you in his own statement — he's a cowboy. He has a day job. I don't want this Court — because of all that has been written about, I don't want this Court to think that his career choice is to be a transporter of narcotics. This is not his choice.

He has a day job. And if you were to say that in a year, he spent 12 days of that year transporting or holding the cocaine — and, by the way, when we talk about holding the cocaine, it's not storage for months or weeks; this is very valuable property to the purchasers, and, generally speaking, it was more of a clearinghouse. That was exactly when the Mexicans would come that same day or the day after, at most, and they would pick up their product. But my client has nothing to do with the major people.

One of the things that I have to say about minor role -- and that's with a little M, not a big M-- and that is

that I think the Commission, which are people who are experts in sentencing, wanted to clarify was that a person who is much less culpable than the people in that indictment — not the regular people, but the people in that indictment — that person should get minor role, with a capital M, but I'm not going there, I'm going with a lower M and variance, because that's really the problem that defense lawyers have. Some of the very considerations that you're asked to rule upon to determine whether somebody has minor role are the same kind of considerations that you would have when you deal with 5358,

What I have here is kind of a roster of not only the people that he was indicted with, but, as Jason Richman said, Assistant Richman said, it was all a big conspiracy. So I'm not even just talking about the conspiracy that he was in, where I want the record to reflect that he knew no one. He knows no one in his own indictment. The only person he knows is Ardon. That's what I mean. I'm just saying that you're really dealing with a person that got involved in drugs, period. He's not a career person in this.

When he was joined with those people, he knows none of the people, and Ardon, as irony would have it, is in a separate, altogether separate, indictment, which I don't understand why he wasn't put with that person. If there was ever a relationship, it's between boss and worker, or capo and

worker. He worked for Ardon.

Because what really is going on here, there really are two conspiracies here. One is just a run-of-the-mill — I know Judge Weinfeld hated that phrase — but run-of-the-mill narcotics case. And that's what this is. This is a run-of-the-mill. This man has nothing to do with, quote, state-sponsored narcotic trafficking.

When he came here, the sad part of it is, or the ironic part of it is, is that he figures, he and his uncle figure, that they're going to be accountable, they're going to come up here, they're going to plead guilty to an indictment, little did they know they were going to walk into a huge indictment, which got play all the time. So if they had any idea that they were going to come here under the radar, they were in for a big surprise, and they were in a big surprise.

So, I'm looking at the roster of people that he was with in which he was less culpable. And I say that in the 3553 sense, not in a guideline sense. Victor Hugo Diaz Morales was the most important major narcotics trafficker in Western Honduras. He is the named person on this indictment. Juan Antonio Hernandez Alvarado, a/k/a Tony, I don't have to tell you about him because you know him very well, your Honor, having presided at the trial.

Mario Jose Hernandez, a former mayor and narcotrafficker, who imported, quote, massive quantities of

cocaine into the United States and engaged in large-scale shipping with traffickers in Colombia, Honduras, Guatemala, and Mexico.

Mauricio Pineda, a former high-ranking member of the Honduran National Police.

Geovanny Fuentes Ramirez — I've got to be frank with you, your Honor, when I read the sentencing minutes on this particular defendant, I was rooting for the good guys, and I mean the good guys. It was unbelievable, as my cocounsel, my colleague, said, what this man did and what this man was capable of, and he is a codefendant with this man.

Then there's Juan Orlando Hernandez, which I guess this Court will be seeing soon, who was the head of the -- the ex-President of Honduras. There's Juan Carlos Bonilla, chief of the Honduran police. There is Rivera Maradiaga, who, with my client, had a hand in murdering 125 people. And the tortures, you know, it's just another aspect --

THE COURT: What did you just say?

MR. ZAPP: Excuse me?

THE COURT: You might want to talk to Mr. Feitel for a second.

MR. FEITEL: Thank you, your Honor. I think my cocounsel misspoke.

THE COURT: I think he might have.

(Counsel confer)

MR. ZAPP: I'm so sorry. I meant Los Cachiros with Ardon, Alex Ardon. I'm very sorry. Thank you for pointing it out.

THE COURT: I understood you had misspoke.

MR. ZAPP: Yes.

And so other than Rivera Maradiaga, I was going to end this by speaking about Ardon Soriano, who is my client's boss, if you will. Certainly, I think "boss" is probably a misnomer because it looks like a card-carrying member of the conspiracy, and, basically, he performed a specific service. No one is suggesting that he made decisions or negotiated prices or acted in any authoritarian capacity.

Then you have the limited -- I mean the related indictments, the Rosenthals, who laundered \$15,000, and the top money launderer there got 36 months after cooperating.

So I think what I'm trying to tell the Court is that this is the perfect definition from the powers that be, from the people who specialize in these sentencings, that my client deserves a minor-role consideration with a small M. It's hard to try to keep track of it because they both are relevant in both contexts.

So I want the Court to be aware of that, that ten years in this particular case, which could be defined as a person who is really less culpable, he just fits the bill.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Zapp.

Ronald Enrique Salguero-Portillo, this is your opportunity to speak, to address the Court directly. If there's anything you wish to say, this is the time to say it.

And, Mr. Zapp, could you just move the microphone a little bit closer to your client.

MR. ZAPP: Oh, sure. Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: You may remain seated, sir.

DEFENDANT SALGUERO-PORTILLO: Your Honor, I would like you to know who I am before you sentence me. I'm an ordinary person that lived a normal life. I'm in the ranching business. My life consisted of waking up before dawn, going to milk my cows with my group, selling milk to a lady who would use them to make cheeses, and then spending the major part of each day supervising my ranch, maintaining and repairing its structures, while I sought to protect my cattle.

I used to have lunch with my workers, and then I would return home for lunch. I would eat with my family, my wife and three children. I would watch television for a little while, and then I would go to bed for the night. And I would do the same thing the next day and every day after that.

Whatever deliveries of drugs that were made that were done for Alex Ardon, even those that happened twice in one month, don't take into account the many months in which there was nothing to transport. Even if there were six months of double deliveries, that would only cover about 12 days or no

more than two weeks in one year. Those don't take into account the other 50 weeks in which I was a rancher, a cowboy, and -
THE INTERPRETER: Pardon, your Honor, the interpreter is clarifying a term.

(Pause)

DEFENDANT SALGUERO-PORTILLO: It doesn't take into account my life as a rancher, a cowboy, or a mountain person.

I don't have a criminal record. I never leave my home for the night. I never drink too much, and I don't use drugs.

I lived a very simple, very regimented life, the same as other ranchers like me.

I'd like your Honor to know that I recognize and admit my bad behavior. I'm ashamed of what I did. I'm painfully aware of the dishonor and disrespect that I have brought upon my family, which is devastating in a small town like mine.

I'd like your Honor to know that I accept full responsibility for my actions without any excuses, especially because I didn't have to do any of this to survive. I live with that reality every day of my life. It's a weight that I carry.

I have an 89-year-old mother with whom I would like to spend a little more time. So I'd like the U.S. Attorneys to know that I'm -- I'm ready to help in any way I can in the future.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

This is the government's opportunity to speak.

MR. WIRSHBA: Yes, your Honor.

It's the government's position that these defendants had a limited role, yes, but a vital one. And in no sense of the term were these defendants' roles, in the government's view, minor, whether it was with a capital or with a lower case letter.

It's the government's view that these defendants had an essential role in this conspiracy, in that they owned the property that was a vital transport between Honduras and Mexico.

It is the case, as defense counsel have said, that this may not have required any specialized knowledge, but that is not a mitigating factor. The defendants were in a specialized position. They held this property that was an important transit point, and they used that property to transport thousands of kilos of cocaine.

This opportunity was not available to anyone. And while it may be the case that someone else could have done this, could have been in this role, the bottom line is that they were the ones who owned the property.

This is an aggravating factor. As one of the defendants just said, this was not something that the defendants needed to do, they had other jobs, they were making

a living. They chose to do this out of greed, and to use their property to facilitate thousands of kilos of cocaine up to Mexico and eventually to the United States.

Now, to Mr. Feitel's point about the fact that they did not control exactly how much cocaine was coming in at any individual time, whether it was five kilos or more, the bottom line, your Honor, is that it was more, much more. And what that shows, that there was a willingness to allow thousands of kilos of cocaine to sit on these ranches, means that it was a matter of trust between the other members of the conspiracy and these defendants, to keep that cocaine safe.

The defense has tried to characterize these defendants as, in one case, an employee of Alex Ardon. That does not comport with the facts. These defendants were partners with Alex Ardon, they were coconspirators with Alex Ardon, and they had an independent relationship with Alex Ardon and the Mexicans who came down to pick up drugs from their land. These were not workers. These were not people who just took orders from others. These were people who, for at least a period for all this cocaine, were in exclusive control of it and were responsible for protecting it from others who might try to seize it and from the government. And other members of the conspiracy, the Mexican cartels who would come and pick up that cocaine and the Honduran traffickers who would bring it up to them, relied on these defendants for that purpose. It was

important.

Your Honor asked about voluntary surrender, and there's been a lot of discussion about that. I just want to make it clear that, from the government's perspective — and I think it comports with what defense counsel have said today — the basis for that voluntary surrender was not a desire to settle this case quickly or to accept responsibility, it was fear, fear of what would happen to them if they remained in Guatemala, that required them to get out of that country before arrest.

Now, last, your Honor, I'll move on to just relative culpability, because I think that's also been a feature of both presentations by the defendants today.

It's the government's position that the guidelines do account for that relative culpability, and that's why the government seeks a guideline sentence in this case for both defendants. This was thousands of kilograms of cocaine, much like many of the other defendants who have come before this Court in this same indictment and set of superseding indictments, but those other defendants, their guidelines were higher — their guidelines were, in many cases, life — and the Court sentenced at least two of them in accordance with those guidelines. The guidelines here are less. They are 210 to 262 months, and it's the government's view that a guidelines range in this case would be appropriate for both defendants.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Wirshba.

This is the Court's statement of reasons for the sentence to be imposed on Otto Rene Salguero-Morales and Ronald Enrique Salguero-Portillo.

In sentencing the defendants, I've considered each of the materials that I referenced at the outset, all the written materials that I referenced; I've considered the thoughtful statements of Mr. Feitel, Mr. Zapp, and Mr. Wirshba; I've considered the sincere statements of Otto Salguero and of Ronald Salguero; I've considered each of the factors under Section 3553(a). I need not recount all that I've considered, but I have considered them. I'll comment on some.

The defendants have entered pleas of guilty to participating in a conspiracy to manufacture, distribute, and possess with intent to distribute five kilograms and more of cocaine knowing that it would be imported into the United States and into waters within a distance of 12 miles of the coast of the United States, and brought it aboard an aircraft registered in the United States. And this conspiracy lasted from 2004 through 2019.

They each also pled guilty to, during and in relation to the narcotics conspiracy, possessing firearms and aiding and abetting the use, carrying, and possession of firearms, specifically machine guns that were capable of automatically

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

shooting more than one shot.

In the presentence report, to which neither defendant has objected, they're described as large-scale drug traffickers who facilitated the transportation of thousands of kilograms of cocaine moving through Central America on their way to the United States. And to aid this effort, they used, aided and abetted the use of, and conspired to use firearms to protect the narcotics trafficking activities.

They had a ranch or a finca located on the Honduran-Guatemala border - they controlled it at least - and it was used as a transshipment point between Honduran drug traffickers who received the cocaine from Colombia and Venezuela and the Mexican traffickers responsible for bringing the cocaine into the United States. And on occasions in 2003 and 2005, they facilitated the transportation of hundreds of kilograms from Los Amates to the Mexican-Guatemala border by helicopter. And from 2010 to 2012 alone, each trip involved -and these were bimonthly or monthly trips that Ardon made to deliver cocaine to the defendants for the ultimate benefit of the Mexican traffickers and the Sinaloa Cartel. And during that 2010-2012 period alone, each trip involved the transport of hundreds to over a thousand kilograms of cocaine. cocaine loads were transported in cattle trucks and dump trucks, each capable of transporting approximately 750 kilograms per truck.

On one occasion, Ardon transported 280 kilograms of cocaine, which arrived in Honduras by helicopter. And on this occasion, they provided security with automatic machine guns and bazooka, and Ardon took the cocaine with the armed workers to the transport facility operated by the two defendants here, and they took possession of the cocaine load.

They agreed that they're responsible for more than 450 kilograms of cocaine.

I recognize that they were ranchers, or farmers, who were lured into this by the prospects of easy money. They did play an essential role, a critical role, in the drug transport chain. Not every human being would be in a position to hold this role or conduct this operation, because it required access to a ranch or farm on the Guatemala-Honduras border.

I've also considered the fact that these defendants voluntarily surrendered. I recognize that there may have been mixed motivation, and I don't, for a second, think that one of the motivations were that they wanted to purge themselves of their wrongdoing, but I recognize that they did surrender, they negotiated their surrender, and they faced the music, so to speak, unknowing exactly what the ultimate consequences would be, as they still don't know because I haven't passed sentence. But that is something that I take account of, as well as what has been described, ever so briefly in the record here, as meeting with the government, but not being signed up as a

cooperator. There's no suggestion that they provided inaccurate information, but, rather, it was found not necessary in view of the fact that Mr. Ardon had been signed up as a cooperator.

So, for me, this is an especially difficult sentencing decision. One of the things that I didn't hear from the defendants that weighs on my mind is the misery, the disease, the broken families that result from this cocaine entering the U.S. shores, the children who will not go home to a father because the father was done in by drug-related violence or drug-related criminal behavior, not just drug trafficking, but thefts to support drug use, and disease and addiction. So people are either killed on the street, wind up in jail, wind up saddled with addiction or other disease, and that's the price paid by reason of this criminal behavior.

Is it too much to ask that someone on a finca in Guatemala think of this? I don't think so. Yet, I understand how somebody could view this as something of an abstraction to them, lured by the money. And it was acknowledged that they had a pretty good life, all considered, without the drug trafficking.

So there's no injustice here. I take account of the fact that they're not charged with specific acts of violence themselves. And, again, I've noted that they came here voluntarily. And it's a matter of speculation whether or not

the U.S. would have been successful in extraditing them and whether they would have successfully — even if they sought to, whether they would have secured their attendance or whether they would have met with a different fate, which would have deprived the government of the ability to prosecute a case against them. All that is speculation at this point.

But considering the sentencing guidelines, policy statements, and official commentary of the United States

Sentencing Commission, considering it in an advisory manner, and recognizing that I am not obligated to sentence within the sentencing guidelines, and also recognizing there is a need to avoid unwarranted sentence disparities among defendants convicted of the same type of offense, I conclude that a sentence of 144 months' imprisonment, five years' supervised release, waiver of the fine based on limited assets, limited earning ability — is forfeiture sought?

MR. WIRSHBA: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

-- and the imposition of a special assessment of \$200 is sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to achieve the purposes of Section 3553(a).

Does the defendant or his counsel have any objection to the Court's proposed sentence or to the statement of reasons for that sentence?

First, Otto Salguero?

25

conditions:

1 MR. FEITEL: No, your Honor. 2 THE COURT: Ronald Salguero? 3 MR. ZAPP: No, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: The government? 5 MR. WIRSHBA: No, your Honor. 6 THE COURT: All right. The defendants will please 7 stand, and I will impose sentence. Otto Rene Salguero-Morales, Ronald Enrique 8 9 Salquero-Portillo, it is the judgment of this Court that you 10 are sentenced to 144 months on Count One and 144 months on 11 Count Three, each term to run concurrently. Further, upon release from imprisonment, you shall be 12 13 placed on supervised release for a period of five years, with 14 the following terms and conditions: 15 You must not commit another federal, state, or local crime, nor unlawfully possess a controlled substance; 16 17 You must refrain from any unlawful use of a controlled substance and must submit to drug testing when requested, 18 except that the above drug testing condition is suspended based 19 20 on the Court's determination that you pose a low risk of future 21 substance abuse. 22 You shall comply with the standard conditions of 23 supervision that appear on pages 24 and 25 of Otto's report and

pages 28 and 29 of Ronald's report, with the following special

You must obey the immigration laws and comply with the directives of immigration authorities;

You shall submit your person and any property, residence, vehicle, papers, computer, or other electronic communication, data storage devices, cloud storage or media and effects to a search by any U.S. probation officer and, if needed, with the assistance of any law enforcement. The search is to be conducted when there is reasonable suspicion concerning violation of a condition of supervision or unlawful conduct by the person being supervised. Failure to submit to a search may be grounds for revocation.

You shall warn any other occupants that the premises may be subject to search pursuant to this condition. Any search shall be conducted at a reasonable time and in a reasonable manner.

You may be supervised in the district of your residence.

It is further ordered that you must pay to the United States a special assessment of \$200, which shall be due immediately.

For the reasons indicated, the fine is waived.

You have the right to appeal the sentence I have imposed upon you. If you cannot afford the cost of an appeal, you may apply for leave to appeal as a poor person. The time limits for file a notice of appeal are brief, and they are

strictly enforced. If you request, the Clerk of Court will prepare and file a notice of appeal on your behalf immediately.

Do you understand, Otto Salguero?

DEFENDANT SALGUERO-MORALES: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand, Ronald Salguero?

DEFENDANT SALGUERO-PORTILLO: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

I will recommend to the Bureau of Prisons that each defendant be housed as close to New York City as is feasible, to facilitate family visitation.

MR. ZAPP: Your Honor, could I be heard?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. ZAPP: If it's at all possible, and I think it is, but I just would like the Court to note that the two would like to be together in the same facility, and it's especially important because they hardly ever get to see their family. My client hasn't seen his family in years. So I don't think that it could hurt, let's put it that way.

THE COURT: Well, I appreciate what you say, and as a sentencing judge, I certainly have no objection to that, and this record will reflect that. That is a matter that I invite you, as counsel, to take up with the Bureau of Prisons, and you can indicate the sentencing judge did not indicate any objection.

MR. ZAPP: Okay. Thank you very much, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. 1 2 Anything further from the government, underlying 3 indictment? 4 MR. WIRSHBA: Yes, your Honor. The government would 5 seek to dismiss the underlying counts. 6 THE COURT: All right. 7 Without objection, that is granted. Anything further from the government? 8 9 MR. WIRSHBA: Nothing from the government, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: From the defendants? 11 MR. FEITEL: No, your Honor. Thank you very much. 12 MR. ZAPP: No, your Honor. 13 THE COURT: All right. 14 Otto Salquero, Ronald Salquero, I wish you both long 15 and healthy lives. I hope the time goes by uneventfully for 16 you, that you figure out how to make it up to people who have 17 suffered as a result of your crimes. And, again, I wish you a healthy return to Guatemala when your sentence is completed. 18 19 We are adjourned. Thank you. 20 COUNSEL: Thank you, your Honor. 21 (Adjourned) 22 23 24